



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,308	02/09/2001	Fu-Tai Shih	10005922-1	6695

22879 7590 03/10/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/780,308	Applicant(s) SHIH ET AL.	
	Examiner Djenane M. Bayard	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 12/22/05 in which claims 1-10 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. As per claim 1, Applicant argues that there is no mention of HTTP request. However, Kenworthy teaches wherein the firewall examines the header of a data packet and determines whether the data packet meets certain minimum format requirements. For example a particular protocol network may require the header of a data packet to contain certain fields, having certain information and comprising a certain number of bytes. HTTP is a request/response protocol between client and servers (See col. 7). It is well known in the art that "HTTP request" are data packets sent from a client to a server based on the HTTP protocol. Therefore, it is would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to consider an http request as a data packet. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Kenworthy has no mention of withholding or retiring and data packets with incomplete packet headers are discarded immediately. Claim 1 recites "withholds from a request processor incomplete HTTP requests and that retires incomplete HTTP request to avoid exceeding a storage limitation." However, if the "exceeding storage limitation" is set to null the request will be immediately discarded as set forth in the claimed invention of Kenworthy. The applicant is interpreting the claims very narrow without considering the broad teaching of the references used in the rejection. It should be noted the Office is entitled to the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims.

- b. As per claim 2, Applicant argues that neither Kenworthy nor Goddard discloses a trap that sends complete HTTP request to a deferral manager. However, Kenworthy clearly teaches a

Art Unit: 2141

filter that will forward authorized data packet to the data management component (See col. 7).

Goddard teaches wherein requests are forwarded from the server to the dispatcher. The dispatcher stored data requests received from clients (See page 3, paragraph [0028]).

Furthermore, Goddard teaches wherein the request is HTTP request (See page 3, paragraph [0033]).

c. As per claim 3 and 7, Applicant argues that neither Kenworthy nor Nace discloses incomplete HTTP request. However, Kenworthy teaches wherein the firewall examines the header of a data packet and determines whether the data packet meets certain minimum format requirements. For example a particular protocol network may require the header of a data packet to contain certain fields, having certain information and comprising a certain number of bytes. HTTP is a request/response protocol between client and servers. It is well known in the art that "HTTP requests" are data packets sent from a client to a server based on the HTTP protocol. Therefore, it is would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to consider an http request as a data packet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,317,837 to Kenworthy.

a. As per claims 1 and 5, Kenworthy teaches an admissions control system for a host site comprising a trap that withholds from a request processor incomplete HTTP requests (See col. 7, lines 59-65, If the necessary information is not included in the data packet, the data packet is deemed incorrectly) and that retires incomplete HTTP requests to avoid exceeding a storage limitation (See col. 7, lines 64-635 if the incoming data packet header is determined to be incomplete, the data packet is immediately discarded)

5. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Denial of service Protection, The Nozzle to Elizabeth Strother.

a. As per claims 9 and 10, Strother teaches an admission control system for a host site comprising a trap that withholds from a request processor initially incomplete HTTP requests (See pages 37-39, *any ring in the nozzle can be configured to block traffic upon certain criteria ... Each ring has a trusted buffer and an untrusted buffer*), said trap passing subsequently completed ones of said initially incomplete HTTP requests to said request processor (See page 37, *Each ring has a configurable policy to move data from the untrusted buffer to the trusted buffer ... a ring can be configured to request additional information from the source thereby gathering additional information about the source to determine trustworthiness*), said trap retiring without passing to said request processor those of said initially incomplete HTTP

Art Unit: 2141

requests that fail to be completed before a time allowed for their completion lapses (See page 38 and 39, *if the occupied portion of the untrusted buffer exceeds the threshold value, the timeout value will be decreased until the occupied space of the buffer is lower than the threshold*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,837 to Kenworthy and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0083117 to Goddard.

a. As per claim 2, Kenworthy teaches the claimed invention as described above. However Kenworthy fails to teach a deferral manager, said trap sending complete HTTP requests to said deferral manager, said deferral manager sending some of said complete HTTP requests to said request processor and responding with deferral messages to some others of said complete HTTP requests.

Goddard teaches said trap sending complete HTTP requests to said deferral manager, said deferral manager sending some of said complete HTTP requests to said request processor and responding with deferral messages to some others of said complete HTTP requests (See page 1, paragraph [0010]).

Art Unit: 2141

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate said trap sending complete HTTP requests to said deferral manager, said deferral manager sending some of said complete HTTP requests to said request processor and responding with deferral messages to some others of said complete HTTP requests as taught by Goddard in the claimed invention of Kenworthy in order to provide quality, reliability and timeliness assurances (See page 1, paragraph [0003]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3, 6 and 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,837 to Kenworthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,823,380 to Nace et al.

a. As per claims 3 and 6, Kenworthy teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Kenworthy fails to teach wherein said trap includes at least one queue and a queue manager, said queue manager storing incomplete HTTP requests in said queue, said queue manager retiring a previously stored recent incomplete HTTP request when necessary to make room for a new incomplete HTTP request.

Nace et al teaches at least one queue and a queue manager, said queue manager storing incomplete HTTP requests in said queue, said queue manager retiring a previously stored recent

Art Unit: 2141

incomplete HTTP request when necessary to make room for a new incomplete HTTP request
(See col. 2, lines 5-30)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate at least one queue and a queue manager, said queue manager storing incomplete HTTP requests in said queue, said queue manager retiring a previously stored recent HTTP request when necessary to make room for a new HTTP request as taught by Nace et al in the claimed invention of Kenworthy in order to read and process the requests based upon a rate determined by the scheduler (See col. 5, lines 12-16).

b. As per claim 7, Kenworthy teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Kenworthy teaches storing a first incomplete HTTP request; and retiring a previously stored incomplete HTTP request when necessary to make room for said first incomplete HTTP request (See page 5, paragraph [0041]). However, Kenworthy et al failed to teach wherein the requests are stored in a queue.

Nace et al teaches wherein the requests are stored in a queue (See col. 2, lines 5-30).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the request are stored in a queue as taught by Nace et al in the claimed invention of Kenworthy in order to read and process the requests based upon a rate determined by the scheduler (See col. 5, lines 12-16).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 4 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner



DJENANE BAYARD
PATENT EXAMINER